



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,885	05/21/2002	Ko-Chien Chuang	CEIP0041USA	2359

27765 7590 02/26/2004

NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

PERVEEN, REHANA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/063,885

Applicant(s)

CHUANG, KO-CHIEN

Examiner

Rehana Perveen

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, Patent No. 5,841,424, in view of Lemke et al, Patent No. 6,694,428.

Kikinis was cited as prior art in the previous office action.

As to claim 1, Kikinis teaches a personal digital assistant system comprising a cradle comprising a cradle housing and a first socket positioned on the cradle housing for outputting electric power, a peripheral module positioned on the cradle and electrically connected to the first socket of the cradle, and a personal digital assistant comprising a first connecting port electrically connected to the first socket of the cradle, wherein the cradle provides the personal digital assistant and the peripheral module with electric power (figure 4, col. 4 line 30 – col. 5 line 15).

However, Kikinis does not expressly teach the personal digital assistant controlling operations of the peripheral module through the first connecting port.

Art Unit: 2182

Lemke et al teach a personal digital assistant controlling operations of a peripheral module through a first connecting port (col. 1 line 41 – col. 2 line 11).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kikinis and Lemke et al because Lemke et al's PDA controlling peripheral would have enabled improved expandability by expanding functionality of the prior existing PDA-based systems.

As to claim 2, Kikinis teaches the cradle further comprises a second socket (figure 4, col. 4 lines 30-61).

As to claim 3, Kikinis teaches the peripheral module comprises a second connecting port for electrically connecting to the second socket of the cradle (figure 4, col. 4 lines 30-61).

As to claim 4, Kikinis teaches the peripheral module further comprises a third socket (figure 4, col. 4 lines 30-61).

As to claim 5, Kikinis teaches the third socket is used for electrically connecting to the first connecting port of the personal digital assistant (col. 4 line 31 – col. 5 line 15).

Art Unit: 2182

As to claim 6, Kikinis teaches the second connecting port is used for electrically connecting to the first socket of the cradle (figure 4, col. 4 lines 30-61).

As to claims 7-10, 13, and 14, Kikinis teaches the peripheral module is a VGA module or a USB module, or a network module, or a keyboard module (col. 4 line 4 – col. 5 line 27).

As to claim 11, Lemke et al teach the peripheral module comprises an I/O port for electrically connecting to a peripheral device (col. 2 lines 1-32).

As to claim 12, Kikinis teaches a personal digital assistant having a first connecting port for connecting to a cradle, a peripheral module comprising a socket for electrically connecting to the first connecting port, an I/O port for electrically connecting to a peripheral device, and a peripheral circuit electrically connected to the socket and the I/O port (figure 4, col. 4 line 30 – col. 5 line 15).

However, Kikinis does not expressly teach the peripheral module for expanding functionality of the PDA. Kikinis also does not expressly teach a power control function such that when the peripheral device requires less than a predetermined amount of electrical power, the peripheral circuit allows a connected PDA to provide power to the peripheral device, and when the peripheral device requires at least the predetermined

Art Unit: 2182

amount of electrical power, the peripheral circuit does not allow the connected PDA to provide power to the peripheral device.

Lemke et al teach the peripheral module for expanding functionality of the PDA (col. 2 lines 1-6). Lemke et al also teach a power control function such that when a peripheral device requires less than a predetermined amount of electrical power, a peripheral circuit allows a connected PDA to provide power to the peripheral device, and when the peripheral device requires at least the predetermined amount of electrical power, the peripheral circuit does not allow the connected PDA to provide power to the peripheral device (col. 2 lines 20-60).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine teachings of Kikinis and Lemke et al because Lemke et al's expanding functionality and power control technique, when incorporated into Kikinis' system, would have provided improved efficiency in prior existing PDA-based systems.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2182

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rehana Perveen whose telephone number is 703-305-8476. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey C Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rehana Perveen', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Rehana Perveen
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2182